

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/634,312	08/08/2000	Mikio Kurihara	JP9-1999-0161US1(8728-410	5044
46069 75	90 09/27/2005		EXAMINER	
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC			DUONG, THOI V	
130 WOODBU WOODBURY,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·			2871	

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· 1 ·	*			
<del></del>	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Advisory Action	09/634,312	KURIHARA ET AL.		
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit		
,	Thoi V. Duong	. 2871		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address		
THE REPLY FILED 14 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE T		•		
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to ore this application, applicant must timely file one of the foll places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a far a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires <u>03</u> months from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this</li> </ol>	lowing replies: (1) an amendm Notice of Appeal (with appeal ance with 37 CFR 1.114. The ideate of the final rejection.	nent, affidavit, or other evidence, which fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; reply must be filed within one of the folk	or (3) owing	
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) of TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	e later than SIX MONTHS from th or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WH	e mailing date of the final rejection.		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The da have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of th set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office la may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(NOTICE OF APPEAL)	extension and the corresponding e shortened statutory period for roter than three months after the m (b).	amount of the fee. The appropriate extensice by originally set in the final Office action; of ailing date of the final rejection, even if timeless.	on fee or (2) as ly filed,	
<ul> <li>2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in corfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exa Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be file AMENDMENTS</li> <li>3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection (a) They raise new issues that would require further (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE be</li> </ul>	tension thereof (37 CFR 41.3 ed within the time period set for the date of filing consideration and/or search (selow);	7(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because see NOTE below);	Since	
<ul> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bappeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling</li> <li>NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)</li> </ul>	a corresponding number of fir		тог	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be	.121. See attached Notice of (s):			
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed amendment(s): a claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	a) 🔲 will not be entered, or b	·	_	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•	•		
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good a was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filir entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

13. Other: \_\_\_\_.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

See Continuation Sheet.

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argued that Hasegawa may show columnar spacers with relatively thin mid-sections, there is no teaching or suggestion that both contact surfaces have contact area greater than the area at the midsection and Figures 12 and 13 of Hasegawa may be drawn from a different depth than Fig. 11 such that the enclosed void at the contact surfaces is obscured. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant's remarks since Figs. 12 and 13 are the fourth modification where the columnar spacer was prepared as in the first modification shown in Fig. 4 (col. 23, lines 61-65). These figures clearly show no void at the contact surfaces. Moreover, Hasegawa also discloses that the cross section of the columnar spacer parallel with the substrate is desirable to be circular or elliptical (col. 10, lines 63-67). As shown in Fig. 7, the columnar spacer 112 was found to be 15 micrometer in diameter (L1) of each of the upper and lower ends (contact surfaces), and 11 micrometer in the diameter (L2) of the narrowest region in the central portion (midsection). Since the area is proportional with the diameter, it is obvious that both contact surfaces of the columnar spacer have contact area greater than the area at the midsection.

TVD

ANDREW SCHECHTER PRIMARY EXAMINER